This is a reply/amendment/letter in the above-identified application and includes the herewith attachment of same date and subject which is incorporated hereinto by reference and the signature below is treated as the signature to the attachment in absence of a signature thereto.

FEE REQUIREMENTS FOR CLAIMS AS AMENDED

	FEE REQUI	KEMENIOL	UK CI	AINIS AS AIVIEN	<u>DED</u>	`	
1. Small Entity claim  A.   NOT made  B.  Withdrawn  C.  made herewith  D.  made previously  Tor B & C  See Required  Separate Paper (Pat-256)	Claims remaining after amendment	Highest number previously paid for		Present Extra	Large/Small Entity	Additional Fee	Fee Code Lg/Sm
2. Total Effective Claims	5	**minus	20	0	x \$18/\$9 =	+\$0	103/203
3. Independent Claims	3	***minus	3	0	x \$84/\$42 =	+ \$0	102/202
4. If amendment enters <u>proper</u> multiple dependent claim(s) into this application for <u>first</u> time (leave <u>blank</u> if this is a <u>reissue</u> application)						+ \$0	104/204
5. Original due Date:       March 9, 2003       NONE         6. Petition is hereby made to extend the original due date to cover the date this response is filed for which the requisite fee is attached       (1 mo) \$110/\$55 = \$410/\$205						and the second s	115/215 116/216 117/217 118/218 128/228
7. Enter any previous extension fee paid since above original due date and subtract - \$0							
8. Extension Fee						+ \$410	
9. If Terminal Disclaimer attached, add Rule 20(d) official fee + \$110/\$55						+ \$0	148/248
10. If IDS attached requires Official Fee under Rule 97 (c),					+ \$180 + \$180	+ \$0	126 126
11. After-Final Request Fee per rules 129(a) and 17(r) + \$750/370						+ \$0	146/246
12. No. of additional inventions for examination per Rule 129(b) x s					x \$750/375 ea	+ \$0	149/249
13. Request for Continued Examination (RCE)						+ \$0	1179/1279
14. Petition fee for						+ \$0	
15. TOTAL FEE =						\$410	
<ul> <li>16. *If the entry in this space is less than entry in next space, the "Present Extra" result is "0".</li> <li>17. **If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 20, write "20" in this space.</li> <li>18. ***If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 3, write "3" in this space.</li> </ul>						PLEASE CHARGE OUR DEP. ACCT	
Our Deposit Account No. 03-3975)							

Our Deposit Account No. 03-3975)
(Our Order No. 61063 264817 C# M#

CHARGE STATEMENT: The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee specifically authorized hereafter, or any missing or insufficient fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith or concerning any paper filed hereafter, and which may be required under Rules 16-18 (missing or insufficiencies only) now or hereafter relative to this application and the resulting Official Document under Rule 20, or credit any overpayment, to our Accounting/Order Nos. shown above, for which purpose a duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

This CHARGE STATEMENT does not authorize charge of the issue fee until/unless an issue fee transmittal sheet is filed.

Query: Is appeal deadline now? If so, file Notice of Appeals separately.

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 10500

McLean, VA 22102

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Intellectual Property Group
By Atty: John P. Darling

Sig: folice P. Ward'

Fax: (703) 905-2500 Tel: (703) 905-2045

Reg. No.

44,482

Atty/Sec: JPD/EED

Tel: (703) 905-2000

NOTE: File this cover sheet in duplicate with PTO receipt (PAT-103A) and attachments



# 16 Response 5/15/03 ares

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION OF

Confirmation No.: 3971

OI et al.

Group Art Unit: 2815

Application No. 09/421,322

Examiner: ECKERT II, GEORGE

Filed: October 18, 1999

Title: DIELECTRICALLY SEPARATED WAFER AND METHOD

OF MANUFACTURING THE SAME

May 9, 2003

## REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Hon. Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 9, 2002, consideration of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 9 are pending in this application.

## Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Ohta et al. (EP 0493116). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action contends that Ohta et al. teaches, in Figures 1a to 1o, a dielectrically separated wafer 13 having a plurality of dielectrically separated monocrystalline silicon islands mutually defined by a dielectrically separating oxide film 6 on the surface of the wafer, wherein the dielectrically separated islands 12 comprise a high concentration impurity layer 2 (col. 4, line 6) formed on the bottom of the islands in a flat plate form; and a

05/12/2003 NMOHAMM1 00000065 033975 0942132

01 FC:1252

410.00 CH